

## **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM COMMITTEE (CIPC)**

Minutes for January 14, 2009

---

**Present:** CIP Members: Chairman David Smith, David Weaver, Mary Ellen Fitzgerald, Cynde Hertzog, Dawn Hayes, Conrad Anker, Todd Mitchell, Larry Beck and Commission Liaison Joe Skinner. Staff: County Administrator Earl Mathers, Grants and Projects Administrator Larry Watson, Procurement/Facilities Manager Nick Borzak, Finance Officer Ed Blackman and Glenda Howze. (Commissioner Murdock joined the meeting late.)

---

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 AM in the Courthouse Community Room.

---

**Public Comment:** There was no public comment on matters not on the agenda.

**Approval of Minutes (October 22, 2008):** Ms. Fitzgerald made a motion to approve the minutes of October 22, 2008 as written. Ms. Hayes seconded the motion. All vote aye. Motion carried unanimously.

**Selection of Committee Chair and Vice Chair:** Chair: Ms. Fitzgerald nominated David Weaver as committee chair. Ms. Hayes seconded the nomination. In discussion Mr. Weaver stated that he would be agreeable to serving as Chair for the remainder of his term. All voted aye. Motion carried unanimously. Vice Chair: Ms. Fitzgerald nominated Dawn Hayes as committee vice chair. Ms. Hertzog seconded the nomination. All voted aye. Motion carried unanimously. These changes will go into effect with the next meeting.

**Distribution of FY 2010 CIP Applications & Discussion Regarding Process:** Ms. Howze explained the process. The Review Team has completed its review of the FY 2010 applications. Chairman Smith gave an explanation of the history of the CIP process for all new members and visitors. Mr. Blackman offered clarification on what constitutes a capital project. Members were requested to rank each application individually and prepare for a joint review at the upcoming CIP meeting.

**Review Team Report re: 2010 Applications:** Mr. Mathers presented the Review Team comments. He began by noting the budgetary uncertainty that the County is facing in the upcoming year. The jail is moving ahead. Changes are being made internally to help the situation as much as possible. A lot more work is being done internally through the Facilities department and some part time employees. The first floor bathrooms have been remodeled within the Facilities budget. There are plans to paint the Guenther Center this summer, within the Facilities budget as well – it will be under \$50,000. The County is focusing on doing everything that we can internally, including addressing the FCI issues. Mr. Mathers offered for Mr. Borzak to report on the progress of items noted in the FCI reports at a future meeting. Mr. Blackman has identified a potential \$500,000 in PILT funds that may be available for new projects in the future, if the County Commission approves this use. This would offer more flexibility for projects. The condition of the L&J is a dominant factor, but the

slightest modification can trigger code issues. Mr. Mathers noted that many applications had insufficient information supplied. He also noted that a new committee is being formed for county staff to address the stimulus funding and how it might best be utilized in Gallatin County.

**2010-01:** The purchase of this item will take place in the current fiscal year with funds that the Clerk & Recorder already has within her budget. Discussion took place regarding what is “equipment” for the purposes of CIP review. Mr. Blackman noted that the Road Department recently leased seven graders that greatly exceed the \$50,000 threshold without any CIP review. Commissioner Skinner stated that he feels this should be ranked by the committee regardless of whether it will be taken care of in FY 2009. Mr. Mathers noted that if the legislature does allow for an all mail ballot election, Gallatin County may be the test County and having the additional scanner will be even more important.

**2010-02:** The Clerk and Recorder/Treasurer Office project will also occur in this fiscal year with the two departments contributing the funds. The switch will require minor work involving expanding the current Treasurer space into the former Planning Department space with the balance of that space being converted into a meeting room. This project should be complete by the end of April.

**2010-03:** The Review Team determined that they don’t believe this will be within budgetary capacity and do not feel it is a priority. Some of the request could be broken out and done in-house. The County Attorney does need better security and Court Services does need a better bathroom situation. Mr. Watson noted that the review team solicited additional review of the project from Think One. Mr. Mathers noted that there have been no actual security issues. The ADA issues are minimal and can be reasonably accommodated on the first floor. Ms. Hayes stated that it would be easier for the CIP to react to and rank the project if it were actually broken into two separate projects. The Review Team presented some alternate ideas for work to be done including closing off the north stair well and working on a bathroom for Court Services, possibly within the Facilities budget.

**2010-04:** This application is for a new Law and Justice Center. This is in the pipeline. The Review Team recommended that if the Commission were in agreement, the \$500,000 PILT funds could be used to start the programming process for this new facility. This is the next step toward making this happen, the programming. The \$500,000 would be enough to cover the programming for both courts and law enforcement spaces. Mr. Watson suggested that the County should leave the door open to the City participating and possibly the State Supreme Court, in the funding of this endeavor, which could also benefit them. He also suggested that the stimulus funding for infrastructure projects is also a possibility. Mr. Mathers stated that the County should broach this subject soon. The City has identified an alternate location for their police department but they don’t have sufficient funding for proceeding at this point. Mr. Watson stated that the City doesn’t think that their schedule will work in conjunction with ours if we work collaboratively. This project is contingent on available funds. Commissioner Skinner asked if we could get any planning funds for this project. Mr. Watson stated that we can’t use Community Development Block Grant funds, but there are other potential funds that could be sought out. Mr. Weaver asked if the programming is a separate project from the construction and if so, if it shouldn’t be treated like a separate application item. Mr. Blackman noted that the 25.6 million dollar estimation includes the programming costs. Projects of this nature start with a small amount and then grow. It is the beginning of the project, but not a separate item. Mr. Weaver asked how the committee can prioritize the programming fee without prioritizing the entire cost of the project. Mr. Blackman suggested that the committee prioritize the whole project.

**2010-05:** This project has previously been determined as a priority, but should be ranked based on funding availability. The Review Team recommended it be addressed in a future year 2011 or later, depending on available funding.

**2010-06:** This project was funded by the Commission in FY 2009 and is currently under solicitation for bids. Should be completed within current FY.

**2010-07:** The Review Team determined that these miscellaneous projects are maintenance items and should be funded within the Department's budget. Individually they would not meet the \$50,000 threshold and they are not related enough to be considered as one project.

**2010-08:** Per the applicant's comments, this project should be completed after the restroom remodel project. The Review Team suggested this project be pushed out to 2011 or greater.

**2010-09:** This project is indicated to be funded with private donations and possibly grants along with some County funds. The Review Team also suggested that additional information may be needed on the preliminary estimates and cost of maintenance. They also suggested that there could be a tie to significant fee increase for parking.

**2010-10 through 2010-14:** The Review Team noted these projects to be primarily funded by outside, private funding. Some may involve CIP if it is determined that they should be funded by a bond of the people or additional County funds. 2010-11 was noted as a possible bond item in FY 2013 or FY 2014. The Review Team also suggested that additional information would be beneficial such as justification for the need for these facilities, maintenance estimates, and inclusion in the overall business plan.

**2010-15 and 2010-16:** The Review Team suggested that they would like to identify a less than comprehensive solution that would be more economical. They also questioned the need for this "large" of a solution. Discussion took place regarding the size of generators and whether entire facilities would need to remain functional or just the data centers. It was noted that the size of the generators is prohibitive. Commissioner Skinner questioned the need for the generators. Mr. Mathers stated that if the data center in these facilities is not operational, the County can't function. If the data center is kept up by a generator, County functions can continue in an alternate location like the EOC. Commissioner Skinner stated that he and Mr. Mathers met with a generator "guy" and discussed the possibility of a portable generator. Even this type of generator has a large container size.

**2010-17:** The air-conditioning for the Guenther Center is for the data room. The Review Team suggested investigating other alternatives for this application as well such as relocating the data center back to the L&J now that there is more room there again or possibly locating the center in the Detention Center when constructed.

**2010-18:** The Review Team suggested that with the current dispatch (911) area becoming available, there are more options for doing a joint remodel of the current court spaces, perhaps in conjunction with the City, to allow joint use of the three courtrooms now available, with possible remodeling and/or expansion of the smaller JP courtroom. There may be code issues with a remodel though, so this would need to be carefully vetted. There is no County obligation to address the City's courtroom issue, but there is a possibility for collaboration. Mr. Blackman noted that the Supreme Court has

determined that the District Courts can schedule four courts within three courtrooms. This could be done with the JP Courts and Municipal courts as well.

**2010-19 and 2010-20:** These applications will be primarily resolved with the construction of a new L&J facility. In the meantime, some storage space will be freed up in the former Facilities Office that could accommodate some of the storage space needs identified in application 2010-20.

**2010-21:** This project can be funded within the existing Rest Home budget. The upgrade is needed and should be completed.

**2010-22:** The Review Team suggested that this project be put on hold for a possible in-house solution, possibly improvements made to the existing structure. They also noted that this is not a viable CIP Project.

**2010-23:** The Review Team suggested that this is not a viable CIP project because the funding amount falls below the \$50,000 threshold and most vehicles are not kept in the County's pool for greater than five years.

**2010-24:** The Review Team noted that this project should be looked at as a joint project with other agencies. This facility would be able to accommodate other purposes such as the Park Service, planning, housing for sheriff deputies, etc. Mr. Watson also stated that the DUI processing building will be available for an alternate purpose once the new jail is constructed, and could be used for this purpose. The Review Team also suggested that a more reliable cost estimate should be secured before continuing with this project.

**2010-25:** The Review Team suggested that this could be addressed in the new law enforcement/L&J complex with a possible use of the vacated Road and Bridge property at the Fairgrounds as an interim solution.

**2010-26:** This project is already in the CIP 5-year plan. See application 2010-04 notes. Programming is the first piece and could begin with Commission use of available funding (PILT).

**Review of Amended Bylaws and Resolution:** Ms. Howze explained that the need for the bylaw amendments and the creation resolution came at the request of the County Attorney's Office in an effort to standardize all boards and committees creation documents. The Committee had no issue with either document.

**Discussion re: Ribbon Cutting Ceremony for Road and Bridge Complex:** Continued to a future meeting.

**Other:** Mr. Borzak asked if a project were to be estimated at \$80,000 but could be done for \$30,000, could it still be considered a capital project. He noted that if not, then it reduces the drive to save money if it has to come from an individual Department's budget. Mr. Mathers stated that it would have to come from the Department budget or Facilities budget.

**Project Updates:** Mr. Watson provided an update on the various projects underway. The Detention Center is on schedule with a February 2<sup>nd</sup> groundbreaking anticipated. The baseball fields are being modified for use as parking north of Dickerson. The Courthouse Annex sprinkler project is on

schedule. There was an issue with frozen pipes in the EHS side but repairs have been made. The installation of heat reznors at the DC is wrapping up on Thursday or Friday of this week. The 911/Fire Station is on schedule or possibly a little ahead of schedule.

**Agenda for Next Meeting (January 28):** The next agenda will be devoted to reviewing of the applications.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:13 AM

---